

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claim 14 has been cancelled, while claims 11, 15 and 16 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 14. In addition, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention, in that the elements therein do not tie to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps.

Claim 16 as amended now indeed ties the elements to another statutory class (e.g., the first and second address translators). Applicants therefore believe that claim 16 is now statutory.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,038,233 to Hamamoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,856,974 to Gervais et al. The Examiner has further rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamoto et al. in view of Gervais et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,483,521 to Aramaki.

The Hamamoto et al. patent discloses a translator for IP networks, network system using the translator, and IP network coupling method therefor.

The Gervais et al. patent discloses an internetwork address mapping gateway which performs a translation from a network

layer address to a globally-unique network layer address before application to a "backbone" network, and upon receipt of a packet from the backbone network, performs a reverse address translation to the originally-assigned network layer address.

Claim 11 (as well as claims 15 and 16) includes the limitation "wherein said communication network further comprises a cross connect for passing packets from the secondary nodes to said separate transmission network, wherein the first address translator is arranged for translating the address information before the packets are applied to the cross connect".

The Examiner has indicated "Gervais discloses network comprising cross connect for passing packets from the secondary nodes to an outside network, wherein the second address translator is arranged for translating the address information before the packets are applied to the cross connect. (see Fig. 3, domain 302 is a crossconnect to different nodes and each node has an address translator wherein the address information is applied before the packets are sent to the crossconnect; col 5 lines 24-44, 55-65; col 7 lines 58-67). Reasons for combining same as for claim 11."

Applicant believes that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, as shown in Gervais et al. in Fig. 3 and described at col. 6, lines 46-65, domain 302 is merely a collection of local computer networks (e.g., source nodes), which is connected to a "backbone" network 340 via one or more routers 306, 308, 310, each containing an address mapping gateway 336. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of "a cross connect for passing packets

from the secondary nodes to said separate transmission network, wherein the first address translator is arranged for translating the address information before the packets are applied to the cross connect".

The Aramaki patent discloses an asynchronous transfer mode cell switching system, which, according to the Examiner, discloses a selector for selecting packets according to address information in their headers.

However, Applicant submits that Aramaki does not supply that which is missing from Hamamoto et al. and Gervais et al., i.e., "a cross connect for passing packets from the secondary nodes to said separate transmission network, wherein the first address translator is arranged for translating the address information before the packets are applied to the cross connect".

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 11-13 and 15-18, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611